

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-25, and 27-32 are pending. Claims 2 and 26 are cancelled. Claims 1, 15 and 25 have been amended herein. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-22, 24-25 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman in view of Blum. Applicant respectfully submits that Pallman in view of Blum does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-22, 24-25 and 27-30. The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which sets forth a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including:

...accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system; executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system; issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system.

Claims 15 and 25 recite limitations similar to those that are recited in Claim 1. Claims 3-9, 11, 13 and 14 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 16-22 and 24 depend from independent Claim 15, and Claims 27-30 and 32 depend from independent Claim 25 and recite further features of the present claimed invention.

Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including the steps of “issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system.” By contrast, Pallman only discloses a method and apparatus for data communication (e.g., data acquisition and delivery). The Pallman reference teaches that modular software may be utilized to acquire/retrieve source data, deliver data to a target, or to perform processing of source data (see Abstract and column 27, lines 33-54). However, the Pallman reference is silent a teaching or suggestion readable on the system of protocol transformations that define the Applicants method for controlling remote systems as is recited in Claims 1, 15 and 25. In fact, nowhere in the Pallman reference is it taught or suggested that commands that are issued through a web browser and transmitted over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components be processed into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarded to a remote system as is set forth in the Applicants’ Claims. Consequently, Pallman simply does not teach what the Examiner relies upon it as teaching and does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicants’ invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 15 and 25.

Blum et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Pallman noted above. Blum et al. alone or in combination with Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer

Protocol including the steps of “issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system.” Blum et al. only discloses a transparent proxy server that facilitates the establishment of data communications between devices (see Abstract). The Blum et al. reference teaches that a transparent proxy application listening on a predetermined port may receive requests in the native protocol of the request and may operate to establish the requested communication (column 3, lines 42-58). Moreover, Blum et al. discloses that it is known in the art that an “encapsulation routine” may encapsulate an FTP command within an HTTP command and thereafter transmit the encapsulated command to a proxy server (column 1, lines 58 – 65). The server may then “strip the FTP command from the HTTP encapsulation before making a connection over the Internet in native FTP mode” (column 1, lines 58 – 67). By contrast, the Applicants’ method as recited in Claims 1, 15, and 25 requires that commands be transmitted over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components and be processed into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarded to a remote system as is set forth in the Applicants’ Claims. Consequently, Pallman either alone or in combination with Blum et al. simply does not teach what the Examiner relies upon it as teaching and does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicants’ invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 15 and 25.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman and Blum, either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 15 and 25 and as such, Claims 1, 15 and 25 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 3-9, 11, 13 and 14 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 16-22 and 24 dependent on Claim 15, and Claims 27-30 and 32 dependent on Claim 25, and that Claims 3-9, 11, 13 and 14, 16-22 and 24, and 27-30 and 32 respectively overcome the Examiner's basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 10, 23 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman in view of Blum et al. and further in view of Bowman-Amuah. The Applicants respectfully submit that neither the Pallman, Blum et al. and Bowman-Amuah references, alone or in combination, anticipates or renders obvious the embodiments of the present invention as are set forth in Claims 10, 23 and 31.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which sets forth a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including:

...accepting a command from an authorized user
by the local computer system; executing the command
through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function
on the remote system; issuing the command through
the web browser on the local computer system;
transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext

Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system.

Claims 15 and 25 recite limitations similar to those that are recited in Claim 1. Claim 10 depends from independent Claim 1, Claim 23 depends from independent Claim 15, and Claim 31 depends from independent Claim 25 and recites further features of the present claimed invention.

Bowman-Amuah does not overcome the shortcomings of Pallman and Blum noted above. Bowman-Amuah alone or in combination with Pallman and Blum does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including the step of “issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system.” Bowman-Amuah only discloses a method for providing communication services over a computer network. Nowhere in the Bowman-Amuah reference is it taught or suggested that commands that are issued through a web browser and transmitted over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components be processed into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarded to a remote system as is set forth in the Applicants’ Claims. Consequently, Bowman-Amuah, Pallman and Blum, either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the Applicants’ method for controlling a

remote system over the Internet as is recited in Claims 1 and 15.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman, Blum et al. and Bowman-Amuah alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1, 15 and 25, and thus Claims 1, 15 and 25 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman, Blum et al. and Bowman-Amuah do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claim 10 dependent on Claim 1, Claim 23 dependent on Claim 15, and Claim 31 dependent on Claim 25, and that Claims 10, 23 and 31 overcome the Examiner's basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman in view of Sridhar et al. Applicant respectfully submits that the Pallman, Blum and Sridhar et al. references, alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in Claims 12. The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which sets forth a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including:

...accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system; executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system; issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol

command to the remote system.

Claim 12 depends from independent Claims 1 and recites further features of the present claimed invention.

Sridhar et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Pallman and Blum noted above. Sridhar et al. alone or in combination with Pallman and Blum does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including the steps of “issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system.” Sridhar et al. only discloses an enhanced network communication system where client and server communications systems are coupled over a data network. Nowhere in the Sridhar et al. reference is it taught or suggested that commands that are issued through a web browser and transmitted over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components be processed into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarded to a remote system as is set forth in the Applicants’ Claims. Consequently, Pallman, Blum and Sridhar et al., either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the embodiment of the Applicants’ invention as it is set forth in Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman, Blum and Sridhar et al. alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited

in Claim 1, and thus Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman, Blum and Sridhar et al. do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claim 12 dependent on Claim 1, and that Claim 12 overcomes the Examiners basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion


In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 4/29, 2004


Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No. 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060